

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nsyolo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/910,206 | 07/20/2001 | Michael Beuten | 10191/1873 | 2708 |
| 26646 KENYON & F | 7590 06/16/200 KENYON LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| ONE BROAD | WAY | RAMPURIA, SATISH | | |
| NEW YORK, | NY 10004 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2191 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/16/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| I | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|--------------------|---------------|--|
| | 09/910,206 | BEUTEN ET AL. | |
| Ī | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | SATISH S. RAMPURIA | 2191 | |

| | SATISH S. RAMPURIA | 2191 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| Sign and the region of the region of the region of the region of the region application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | vhich places the r (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: | | | | | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | hortened statutory period for reply origi | nally set in the final Office | e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl | iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t | filed within two month | s of the date of | | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | | | appeal. Since | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | sideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause | | | | |
| They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially rec | ducing or simplifying to | ne issues for | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | · | • | · · | | | | |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an e | cplanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | before an an the date of filling a Nie | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | |
| 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| /Wei Zhen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191 | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to Applicants arguments that Ross does not disclose the feature of causing the debug logic to trigger an exception, causing the debug logic to execute an exception routing, access to the specific address range includes access to an illegal storage area, as provided by claim 1. Ross's system discloses a debug facility to provide information to a system or application program of another program's access to shared resources and allow the computer system to perform a notification. More particularly, Ross discloses in figures 3, 5A and 5B that the system shows the application program of a peripheral device accessing an address which causes the breakpoint to trigger (col. 4, lines 37-56) i.e., causing the debug logic to trigger an exception upon access to an address. Then the callback routing is executed that indicates the stored breakpoint is accessed via another program (col. 4, lines 37-56), i.e., executing an exceptional routine after the exception is triggered. Further, Ross discloses that a specified address in being accessed by another program which causes an interrupt at the determined address (col. 5, lines 7-15) i.e., accessing to an illegal storage area or protected address. Furthermore, Ross discloses that once the breakpoint is accessed by the another program, e.g., program 1. The system of Ross transfers to a monitor mode, and the breakpoint register is monitored by processor to determine whether the breakpoint has been triggered as indicated in the specified address (col. 4, lines 57-66) i.e., monitoring of the program 1 and program 2 are operating in parallel, in addition, an example as described by Ross that program 1 (electronic mail) and program 2 (monitor power down) are operating in parallel (col. 5, lines 32-47). Finally, Ross discloses the register is accessed to determine the address which caused the interrupt co 3 lines 65 to col. 4 line 2, specifically at col. 5 lines 6-12 and the interrupt handler routine then continues executing (col. 5, lines 25-27). Note that the secure stack check is inherently done without using the program execution time of the microprocessor when the debug logic and its register are operated in parallel to the program execution time.